

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

**Elkhart 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Meeting Standard (3)	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Meeting Standard (3)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Satisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 5:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

*(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Elkhart 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2006-2007 school year, an observation and only a limited document analysis was completed for the 2007-2008 school year).*

### ACTION NEEDED:

Per the provider, issues noted in the Progress Reporting session will be addressed in the 2008-2009 school year.

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Elkhart 21<sup>st</sup> Century Com. Learning Center  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 4/28/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sign-in sheets for initial trainings</li> <li>• Email from Plato documenting trainings offered</li> <li>• Agendas from initial trainings and Plato trainings</li> <li>• Information detailing responsibilities of lead tutors, tutors</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per the application, professional development is offered at the beginning of the year, and ongoing throughout the year as needed with Plato and among staff.</li> <li>• Agenda submitted for initial training (new tutor training) provides a brief description of the program, information about curriculum components, a mini-lesson and Plato demonstration, and information about lead teacher and tutor responsibilities and administrative tasks. This training was offered in September and January.</li> <li>• Plato trainings include information about assessment and monitoring and Plato program and curriculum overview.</li> <li>• Additional SES training (held in January) covered administrative issues and the Plato model.</li> </ul>
Progress Reporting	<b>ALL</b> of the following: -Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports) -Timeline for sending progress reports -Documentation of reports sent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>• SES contracts for Elkhart, Concord</li> <li>• SES agreements</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports are sent every two weeks, which matches the timeline in the approved amended application. Lead tutor information submitted in packet also indicates that progress reports must be submitted every two weeks.</li> <li>• Progress reports include all information</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sample progress reports</li> </ul>		<p>required on the IDOE progress reporting checklist (although not all interim progress reports include pre-assessment scores, final progress reports include pre- and post-assessment scores).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information from two districts surveyed indicates that progress reports have been sent in a timely manner.</li> <li>• Goals on progress reports should be listed in a who, what, by how much, and when manner. For example, instead of listing “vocabulary comprehension” as a goal, the progress report &amp; learning plan should state, “student will improve vocabulary comprehension by 10 percentage points on the Achieve Now assessment at the end of 20 sessions,” or “student will demonstrate mastery on the reading comprehension section of the Achieve Now assessment as demonstrated by a score of 80% at the end of 30 sessions,” etc.</li> <li>• SES agreements have all standards selected. SES agreements should only select the standards that students will be working on in their programs, not all standards listed.</li> <li>• #4 and #5 were not filled in on the SES agreements for Elkhart. Here, the provider and district need to list specific student goals and ways in which progress toward those goals will be measured.</li> <li>• SES agreements for Elkhart on #1 indicate that tutoring will be “one-on-one tutoring services.” However, Elkhart 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC does not provide one-on-one tutoring and is instead small group tutoring. The correct box needs to be checked.</li> <li>• Some progress reports have virtually the same comments on them from report to report and are identical across students. These progress reports appear to be pre-filled out forms where the only changes</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--	---

					<p>made to them are in the “progress” section. They do not appear to be individualized from student to student.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports should provide more detailed information about student strengths, especially if they have changed or grown over time. Some reports are vague; others do not include all information requested on the progress report. For example, most progress reports for one student do not include student’s strengths. Also, some comments are vague/generic. Another progress report states that the student increased but does not say on what. Another progress report indicates under student’s strengths, “some knowledge.” This is very generic.</li> <li>• Progress reports for one student have no information filled in under student’s strengths or areas for improvement. This makes progress reports very vague and general.</li> <li>• On the final progress report, it would likely be helpful to parents to explain why students went down from pre-assessment to post-assessment (as applicable).</li> </ul>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider’s pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of process for developing individual learning plans</li> <li>• Correlation between assessment and ISTEP+/Indiana academic standards</li> <li>• Student learning paths (individual learning plans)</li> </ul>		<b>X</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of process used to develop individual learning plans matches description in approved amended application.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans identify a wide range of lessons that cover students’ skill gaps. Tutors select from these lessons based on students’ high priority goals.</li> <li>• Examples of specific correlation between Plato Achieve Now! Assessment and ISTEP+ provided.</li> <li>• Individual learning plans include specific lessons to be covered using Plato, pre-assessment results, and progress results.</li> </ul>

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Elkhart 21<sup>st</sup> Century Com. Learning Center

**SITE:** Woodland Elementary School, 1220 County Road 3

Elkhart, IN 46514

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** K.K., S.M.

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 2

**DATE:** 4/23/08

**REVIEWER:** MC/CE

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:00PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application			X		In each room, students were working on lessons on the Plato system. Tutors helped the students log on to the system, and students loaded CDs with the Plato program onto their computers. Students were able to choose which lesson (out of the lessons that had been prescribed for them) that they wanted to work on. Tutors interacted with the students and helped them if they had questions. Tutors also stopped with student groups at times and helped them work through the lessons or reinforced skills that students may be having trouble with. Tutors acted as facilitators, with the computer program doing some direct instruction. Some students worked in small groups (groups of 2) while other students worked individually. The computer program had a variety of math and English/language arts activities, including working on finding number of syllables, finding the correct spelling of words, and math computation. The computer gave encouragement when students got the answers right and encouraged them to go back if they answered questions incorrectly. At times, tutors spent more time with some students than others, but generally tutors tried to give equal time to each student or student group. According to the tutoring session description provided, sometimes tutors also provide mini lessons off the computer. Program description in the amended application discusses individual learning plans designed by pre-assessment, as well as occasional mini-lessons and Plato learning games designed to address skill gaps identified on the pre-assessments and in the individual learning plans. Lessons and activities observed, as well as additional information provided in the tutoring session description, match the description in the amended application.
			X		The instruction provided by the computer program (Plato) appeared clear to students.

Instruction is clear					The computer helped them understand what they were supposed to do, how to answer the questions, and whether they had answered questions correctly or incorrectly. The facilitators (tutors) helped students when they were struggling with questions or with a particular lesson. Tutors appeared to provide adjusted instruction based on each student's level of need. For example, in one room one student appeared to be struggling with understanding the concept of what he was practicing on the computer. The tutor spent a great deal of time with that student working through the questions. Less time was spent with the other two groups of students, who appeared to have a strong grasp of the lessons they were completing. In some cases, students did not receive much instruction from the tutor/facilitators, but did receive instructions and encouragement from the computer program. Students appeared to understand what they were expected to do in their lessons.
Time on task is appropriate			X		Students remained on task throughout the time observed. Even when not working with a tutor, students were engaged in their computer programs and in the activities offered through the computer. Although sometimes sounds from the computers were a bit noisy, they did not seem to bother other groups of students. In general, students did not have to wait for long for a tutor to come over to help them if they were having trouble understanding their computer activity. Students seemed to enjoy the Plato activities.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			X		At the beginning of the session, instructors were adept at getting students set up on their Plato activities based on student learning plans. Instructors were knowledgeable of the Plato system and of the hardware being used, which made the transition onto the systems smooth. While students worked, tutors rotated between students and provided help as necessary. Tutors generally did a nice job of ensuring that students did not go too long without tutor attention; at times, tutors would spend more time with a particular student or group of students if that student or group needed additional help. Tutors maintained quiet classrooms and their rotation helped students remain on task.
Student/instructor ratio: 5:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Within each 5:1 group, students were broken into smaller groups of 2, 2, and 1. Observed ratios are in line with approved amended application ratio of 8:1 or smaller.